

### REMARKS

In response to the action of November 30, 2006, applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 1-9, 13-16, 18, and 20 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 18 and 20 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 9, 13, 18 and 20 have been amended, and claims 10-12, 17, 19 and 21 have been cancelled. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 3, lines 25-27; page 4, lines 6-16; page 5, line 31 to page 6, line 9; page 11, lines 26-28; and FIGS. 2B-2C. No new matter has been introduced. This amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez ("SAP R/3 Implementation Guide") in view of Ball (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,863). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because any proper combination of Hernandez and Ball does not describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 18 and 20.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a computer-implemented method that displays a graphical user interface (GUI) on a display device of a computer, where the GUI includes a representation of a condition and a representation of an action of a user-defined rule to process textual information. The condition includes an attribute name, an operator, and an attribute value, and the action includes an action name and an action value. The method also includes receiving, via the GUI, user input that indicates the user-defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template. The rule template has a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule and has an action that is based upon the action of the user-defined rule. The condition of the rule template includes, among other elements, an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule. The action of the rule template further includes, among other elements, an action-value placeholder that is associated with the action value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. The method also includes receiving a second user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the

action-value placeholder, and, in response, creating and storing a second user-defined rule to process textual information. The second user-defined rule is based on the rule template and includes the value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the action-value placeholder. The method further recites using the second user-defined rule to process incoming textual information received from a customer system and triggering the action of the second user-defined rule when the incoming textual information satisfies the condition of the second user-defined rule.

In contrast, Hernandez discloses techniques for implementing SAP R/3 Release 3.0. See Hernandez at page 14. Hernandez discloses, among other disclosures, the R/3 Reference Model, on which business process modeling tools are based. See Hernandez at page 84. However, Hernandez does not describe or suggest many of the features recited in claim 1. For example, although Hernandez discloses “[c]arrying out (assigning and defining conversion rules) the mapping between the legacy systems and R/3,” see Hernandez at page 206, line 15, Hernandez does not describe or suggest receiving, via a graphical user interface, user input that indicates a user-defined rule is to be used to create a rule template and, in response, creating a rule template that includes, among other elements, an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule and an action-value placeholder that is associated with the action value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, as required by claim 1. Nor does Hernandez disclose receiving a user input that indicates a value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder and a value to be used in place of the action-value placeholder, and in response, creating a second user-defined rule to process textual information, where the second user-defined rule is based on the rule template and includes the value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder and the value to be used in place of the action-value placeholder, also as required by amended claim 1. Further, Hernandez’s SAP R/3 Implementation Guide does not describe or suggest using the second user-defined rule to process incoming textual information received from a customer system, and triggering the action of the second user-defined rule when the incoming textual information satisfies the condition of the second user-defined rule, as further required by amended claim 1.

Rather, Hernandez discloses various techniques for implementing SAP R/3 that includes business functionality, implementation tools, a development environment, and tools for monitoring and management of the system. See Hernandez at page 14, lines 3-8. The action asserts that Hernandez discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 except for an attribute value. See action at page 3, line 5 to page 4, line 19. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Hernandez discloses a function builder for "defining and maintaining, administering, and testing the ABAP function modules (general-purpose routines which can be called from other ABAP or external programs using RFC calls) [and] can be used for designing server or client programs to communicate using RFCs by creating RFC templates in C or Visual Basic." Hernandez at page 231, lines 10-18. Hernandez' function builder is not equivalent, as the action asserts, to the claimed rule template. See action at page 3, lines 17-21. As noted above, claim 1 recites creating, in response to the received user input, a rule template having a particular components -- namely, a rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule and an action that is based upon the action of the user-defined rule where: the condition of the rule template includes the attribute name and the operator from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule, the condition of the rule template further includes an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule, the action of the rule template further includes the action name from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, and the action of the rule template further includes action-value placeholder that is associated with the action value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule. Hernandez' function builder does not describe or suggest a rule template having the features recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the action indicates that Hernandez discloses, at page 206, line 15, the attribute-value placeholder that is associated in the attribute value from the corresponding condition in the user-defined rule. See action at page 4, lines 4-7 (stating "associated of applicant is equivalent to "mapping" of Hernandez). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, the cited portion of Hernandez merely discloses that "Performing a massive data load requires: ...Carrying out (assigning and defining conversion rules) the mapping between the legacy

systems and R/3.” Hernandez at page 206, lines 5-15. Hernandez’ disclosure of the need to assign and define conversion rules mapping between legacy systems and R/3 to perform massive data loading does not describe or suggest a creating rule template having a condition that is based upon the condition of the user-defined rule where the condition of the rule template includes an attribute-value placeholder that is associated with the attribute value from the corresponding condition of the user-defined rule, as recited by claim 1. Nor does the disclosure of Hernandez describe or suggest creating rule template having an action that is based upon the action of the user-defined rule where the action of the rule template includes an action-value placeholder that is associated with the action value from the corresponding action of the user-defined rule, as recited by claim 1. See action at page 10, lines 19-22 (asserting, with regard to claim 10, that Hernandez at page 206, line 15 also discloses this feature of claim 1, as amended).

Ball, which is cited by the action as disclosing an attribute value, is directed to providing multiple interfaces that include at least one interface capable of understanding natural language. See Ball at col. 1, lines 58-62 (summarizing invention). Ball does not remedy the failure of Hernandez to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claim 1, as amended.

Accordingly, neither Hernandez, Ball, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or suggests creating a rule template in the manner recited in claim 1. Because neither Hernandez nor Ball, alone or in any proper combination, disclose the claimed rule template, neither Hernandez nor Ball disclose creating, in response to the second user input, a second user-defined rule to process textual information, the second user-defined rule being based on the rule template and including the value to be used in place of the attribute-value placeholder and the value to be used in place of the action-value placeholder, as recited in claim 1. Nor do Hernandez nor Ball describe or suggest using the second user-defined rule to process incoming textual information received from a customer system and triggering the action of the second user-defined rule when the incoming textual information satisfies the condition of the second user-defined rule, features added to claim 1 by this amendment.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and claims 4, 6 and 9, which depend from claim 1.

The action relies on Morwood (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091695), as disclosing an action that includes an action name and value. See action at page 10, lines 19-22 (regarding claim 10). Morwood is directed to a remote computation framework. See Morwood at Abstract. As such, Morwood does not remedy the failure of Hernandez to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. Accordingly, applicant asserts claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 18 and 20 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and do so in the context of a computer-readable medium and system, respectively. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 18 and 20.

Claims 2, 3 and 5, each of which depends from claim 1, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Ball and Whelihan (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0129659). Whelihan, which is cited in the action for disclosing “storing the rule template in a repository accessible to the user” and “a user-defined rule contain[ing] a plurality of conditions,” does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Ball or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2, 3 and 5.

Claims 7 and 8, each of which depends from claim 1, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Ball and Sharpe (“Teach Yourself SAP R/3”). Sharpe, which is cited in the action for disclosing aspects of an attribute-value placeholder, does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Ball or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7 and 8.

Claims 10, 11, 17, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091695). This rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 10, 11, 17, 19 and 21.

As amended, claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 1 and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood and Whelihan. Similarly to the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 5, Whelihan is cited in the action for disclosing "storing the rule template in a repository accessible to the user" and "a user-defined rule contain[ing] a plurality of actions." As described above, Whelihan does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Morwood or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 13 and 14.

As amended, claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 1 and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hernandez in view of Morwood and Sharpe. Sharpe, which is cited in the action for disclosing aspects of a value placeholder, does not remedy the failure of Hernandez, Morwood or any proper combination of the references, to describe or suggest the subject matter of independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 15 and 16.

Applicant's identification of the differences between the claims and the applied references (e.g., Hernandez, Ball, Sharp, Morwood and Whelihan) should not be taken as an admission that any of the applied references properly constitute prior art.

Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, Applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated November 30, 2006, be extended for one month to and including March 30, 2007.

Applicant : Janaki P. Kumar  
Serial No. : 10/824,106  
Filed : April 14, 2004  
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: 13906-171001 / 2004P00206US

The fee in the amount of \$910.00 in payment of the Request for Continued Examination fee (\$790.00) and the one-month extension of time (\$120.00) is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 30, 2007

Barbara A. Benoit  
Barbara A. Benoit  
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No. 26171  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331